UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,625	08/21/2001	Chatschik Bisdikian	YOR920010520US1	6413

877 7590 04/03/2009

IBM CORPORATION, T.J. WATSON RESEARCH CENTER
P.O. BOX 218
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598

EXAMINER	
BAYARD, DJENANE M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2441	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/03/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

iplawyor@us.ibm.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/933,625	BISDIKIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DJENANE M. BAYARD	2441	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 January 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to communication filed on 1/09/09 in which claims 1-39 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1and 38, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 31 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that there is nothing in Hefter to suggest in any way that the teachings therein are applicable to a home network or that there is any interaction with a service. Furthermore, this recitation has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Hefter clearly teaches wherein the *multiplexer/demultiplexer will then establish the path to computer telephone and the computer on a network, the service being the synchronization process (See col. 9, lines 3-57).*

Furthermore, Applicant argues that Hefter fails to teach a telephone modem. However, Hefter clearly teaches a *multiplexer/demultiplexer (See col. 9, lines 50).*

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

As per claim 33, Applicant argues that the web browser is at a terminal and not in the client device. Applicant is entitled to his/he own lexicography however Applicant is respectfully reminded that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In this case the client device of the claimed invention and the terminal of Sawada accomplish the function.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities: There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said computer program product" in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claims 27 and 30 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 because the term "computer readable medium" used in the claims fail to find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 31, 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,092699 to Hefter.

a. As per claim 31, Hefter teaches an apparatus attached on a home network for a user using a client device attached to a wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network, to interact with at least one service on said home network, said apparatus comprising: a telephone modem to directly receive an incoming call from the client device), and also to receive and transmit data over a telephone network (See col. 9, lines 33-57, *multiplexer/demultiplexer)*, said telephone modem having a client port through which the apparatus attaches to the telephone network, said apparatus being a single apparatus through which a user with the client device can establish communication in one step (See col. 7, lines 1-20 and col. 9, lines 33-57), said client device employing only one of a cellular voice network and a PSTN (See col. 4, lines 45-53); a dial-in service module to implement dial-in logic for the client device (See col. 7, lines 1-20), a browser server module for managing data for remote display (See col. 5, lines 20-24), a protocol transport

module to implement protocols needed to transport data back and forth between a browser application in the client device and said browser server module (See col. 7, lines 16-19).

b. As per claim 36, Hefter teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Hefter teaches wherein said dial-in server module triggers at least one particular module in the apparatus to process any incoming calls and requests from the client device (See col. 9, lines 33-55).

c. As per claim 37, Hefter teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Hefter teaches wherein said dial-in server module performs user authentication (See col. 9, lines 11-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-2, 4-16 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0027569 to Ejzak in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735619 to Sawada.

a. As per claim 1, Ejzak teaches A service interaction method comprising a user interacting with at least one remote service accessible through a data distribution network, said data distribution network comprising an aggregation of at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol used to access said at least one remote service from a serving entity (See paragraph [0100]), the step of interacting comprising: enabling remote control of services at a residential network without the necessity of a service provider;
employing only one of a cellular voice network and a PSTN, said user connecting to a serving entity attached to said home data distribution network using a client device attached to a wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network (See paragraph [0022, 0024, 0031 and 0034]). However, Ejzak fails to teach obtaining and viewing a list of at least one remote service from accessible remote services from said serving entity accessible remotely via said home network from said serving entity using at least one of said communications media and one of said communications protocols; selecting said at least one remote service from said list; selecting said at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol that

said at least one remote service uses; and accessing and viewing said at least one remote service in obtaining desired results.

Sawada teaches a home network gateway apparatus and a home network device. Furthermore, Sawada teaches obtaining and viewing a least one remote service from accessible remote services from said serving entity accessible remotely via said home network from said serving entity using least one of said communications media and one of said communications protocols (See col. 1, lines 39-43, col. 2, lines 16-50); selecting said at least one remote service from said list; selecting said at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol that said selected at least one service uses; and accessing and viewing said least one remote service in obtaining desired results (See col. 4, lines 45-56).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Ejzak in order to remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

b. As per claim 2, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Ejzak teaches wherein the client device is portable (See paragraph [0024]).

c. As per claim 4, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Ejzak teaches wherein the step of connecting includes dialing-up directly to the serving entity (See paragraph [0089]).

d. As per claim 5, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak fails to teach wherein the step of viewing is performed employing a viewing device collocated with said client device.

Sawada teaches wherein the step of viewing is performed employing a viewing device collocated with said client device (See col. 4, lines 47-48).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Ejzak in order to remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

e. As per claim 6, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak fails to teach wherein the viewing device depicts information in a form including at least one of: text, graphics, images, light display, voice or any combination of these.

Sawada teaches wherein the viewing device depicts information in a form including at least one of: text, graphics, images, light display, voice or any combination of these (See col. 7, lines 56-61 and figure 4A).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Ejzak in order to remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

f. As per claim 7, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak fails to teach wherein the step of selecting includes employing a menu.

Sawada teaches wherein the step of selecting includes employing a menu (See col. 1, lines 66-67 and col. 2, lines 1-2).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Ejzak in order to remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

g. As per claim 8, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak teaches wherein the step of viewing is performed employing a web-browser and the serving entity is a web-server.

Sawada teaches wherein the step of viewing is performed employing a web-browser and the serving entity is a web-server (See col. 1, lines 39-40 and col. 2, lines 35-38).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Ejzak in order to remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

h. As per claim 9, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Ejzak teaches wherein the step of connecting includes dialing-up to the serving entity through a data network to which the serving entity is connected (See paragraph [0089]).

i. As per claim 10, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore,

Ejzak teaches wherein the data network is the Intranet controlled by an Internet Service Provider (See paragraph [0089])

j. AS per claim 11, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Ejzak teaches wherein the data network uses the TCP/IP protocol suite for transporting information (See paragraph [0004]).

k. As per claim 12, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Ejzak teaches said serving entity employing attributes of said circuit switch network in authenticating said user (See paragraph [0048]).

l. AS per claim 13, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Ejzak teaches wherein said attributes include a telephone number of said client device (See

m. AS per claim 14, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Ejzak teaches wherein said attributes include a telephone number of said serving entity (See paragraph [0089]).

n. As per claim 15, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak teaches establishing credentials so that said at least one remote service can be manipulated in a secure manner on the serving entity.

Sawada teaches establishing credentials so that said at least one remote service can be manipulated in a secure manner on the serving entity (See col. 10, lines 56-58)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Ejzak in order to remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

o. As per claim 16, Ejzak teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak fails to teach wherein the step of viewing views the list on a viewing device in a manner that depends on the user's access privileges to said at least one remote service.

Sawada teaches wherein the step of viewing views the list on a viewing device in a manner that depends on the user's access privileges to said at least one remote service (See col. 10, lines 50-58).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Ejzak in order to remotely to remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

p. As per claim 29, Ejzak teaches an apparatus for a user to interact with at least one remote service (See paragraph [0024]), comprising: user connecting means for said user connecting to a serving entity using a client device attached to a wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network, said user connecting means employing only one of a cellular voice network and a PSTN, and enabling remote control of services at a residential network without the necessity of a service provider (See paragraph [0022, 0024, 0031 and 0034]). Furthermore, Ejzak teaches

second connecting means for attaching said apparatus to a communications medium and using a communications protocols, taken from an aggregation of communication media and protocols, through which said at least one remote service can be accessed (See paragraph [0022, 0024, 0031 and 0034]). However, Ejzak fails to teach user viewing means for obtaining and viewing a list of accessible remote services from said serving entity; user selecting means for selecting said at least one remote service from said list; second selecting means for selecting the communications medium and protocol to access said selected at least one service; and user access means for accessing and viewing said at least one remote service in obtaining desired results (See col. 2, lines 27-38 and col.

Sawada teaches user viewing means for obtaining and viewing a list of accessible remote services from said serving entity (See col. 1, lines 39-43, col. 2, lines 16-50); user selecting means for selecting said at least one remote service from said list; second selecting means for selecting the communications medium and protocol to access said selected at least one service; and user access means for accessing and viewing said at least one remote service in obtaining desired results (See col. 2, lines 27-38 and col. 4, lines 45-56).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Ejzak in order to remotely to remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

q. As per claims 27, 28 and 30, Ejzak teaches an article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing a user to interact with at least one remote service, the computer readable program code

means in said article of manufacture comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the steps of claim 1, a program storage device readable by machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform method steps for causing a user to interact with at least one remote service, said method steps comprising the steps of claim 1 and a physical computer program product comprising a computer readable medium having computer readable program code means embodied therein for causing a user to interact with at least one remote service, the computer readable program code means in said computer program product causing a computer to effect the functions of claim 28.

8. Claims 3 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0027569 to Ejzak in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735619 to Sawada as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,988070 to Kawasaki et al in view of Smart Antennas for wireless communications to Liberti et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,092699 to Hefter.

a. As per claims 3 and 38, Ejzak in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Ejzak teaches wherein the client device is a cellular telephone (See paragraph [0024]); wherein the step of connecting includes dialing-up directly to the serving entity (See paragraph [0034]); wherein the step of connecting includes dialing-up to the 333serving entity through a data network to which the serving entity is connected (See paragraph [0089]); and further comprising: said serving entity employing attributes of said circuit switch network in authenticating said user, wherein said attributes include a telephone number of said

client device, and wherein said attributes include a telephone number of said serving entity; wherein the data network uses the TCP/IP protocol suite for transporting information (See paragraph [0004]); However, Ejzak fails to teach wherein the data network is the Intranet controlled by an Internet Service Provider; the step of viewing is performed employing a viewing device collocated with said client device; wherein the viewing device depicts information in a form including at least one of: text, graphics, images, light display, voice or any combination of these; wherein the step of selecting includes employing a menu; wherein the step of viewing is performed employing a web-browser and the serving entity is a web-server; wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a first generation, analog, cellular network; wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a second generation, digital, cellular network; wherein the step of dialing-up directly to the service entity further includes passing dialing signaling and control data to the serving entity through an intermediary data network; wherein the step of dialing-up to the serving entity through a data network, further includes dialing-up to the serving entity through a sequence of at least one data network, the last one of which the serving entity is attached to; wherein at least one service agent is a computer software module executable on a computer; and wherein the step of viewing views the list on a viewing device in a manner that depends on the user's access privileges to said at least one remote service; establishing credentials so that said at least one remote service can be manipulated in a secure manner on the serving entity; the serving entity providing access to at least one service agent used to access and control said at least one remote service; activating said computer software module prior to invoking a particular remote service; activating said computer software module on demand after a particular remote service has been invoked; storing said

computer software module at a data repository; and dynamically retrieving and activating said computer software module from the data repository after invoking a particular remote service.

Sawada teaches wherein the step of viewing is performed employing a viewing device collocated with said client device (See col. 7, lines 56-61 and figure 4A); wherein the viewing device depicts information in a form including at least one of: text, graphics, images, light display, voice or any combination of these (See col. 7, lines 56-61 and figure 4A); wherein the step of selecting includes employing a menu (See col. 1, lines 66-67 and col. 2, lines 1-2); wherein the step of viewing is performed employing a web-browser and the serving entity is a web-server (See col. 1, lines 39-40 and col. 2, lines 35-38); and wherein the step of viewing views the list on a viewing device in a manner that depends on the user's access privileges to said at least one remote service (See col. 10, lines 50-58); establishing credentials so that said at least one remote service can be manipulated in a secure manner on the serving entity (See col. 10, lines 56-58)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Ejzak in order to make it easy to control information of the home network services (see col. 1, lines 30-34). However Ejzak in view of Sawada fails to teach activating said computer software module on demand after a particular remote service has been invoked; storing said computer software module at a data repository; and dynamically retrieving and activating said computer software module from the data repository after invoking a particular remote service.

Kawasaki teaches wherein at least one service agent is a computer software module executable on a compute; the serving entity providing access to at least one service agent used to

access and control said at least one remote service (See col. 1, lines 28-30 and col. 2, lines 9-13); activating said computer software module prior to invoking a particular remote service; activating said computer software module on demand after a particular remote service has been invoked; storing said computer software module at a data repository; and dynamically retrieving and activating said computer software module from the data repository after invoking a particular remote service (See col. 3, lines 36-40 and col. 5, lines 19-29).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kawasaki in the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of Sawada in order to provide a control system which is easy to manipulate for operating home electrical appliances (See col. 1, lines 25-26). However, Ejzak in view of Sawada and further in view of Kawasaki fails to explicitly teach wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a first generation, analog, cellular network; wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a second generation, digital, cellular network.

Liberti et al teaches wherein wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a first generation, analog, cellular network; wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony 3network is a second generation, digital, cellular network (See page 1 and table 1.1, *Evolution of Wireless communications*).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the wireless communications system of Liberti et al to render the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of Sawada and further in view of Kawasaki operative and functional.

Hefter teaches wherein the step of dialing-up directly to the service entity further includes passing dialing signaling and control data to the serving entity through an intermediary data

network (See col. 9, lines 33-53); wherein the step of dialing-up to the serving entity through a data network, further includes dialing-up to the serving entity (*computer)* through a sequence of at least one data network, the last one of which the serving entity is attached to (See col. 9, lines 33-53).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hefter in the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of Sawada further in view of Kawasaki and further in view of Liberti et al in order to provide integration among wireless devices and the Internet (See col. 1, lines 43-45).

9. Claim17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0027569 to Ejzak in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735719 to Sawada as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,988070 to Kawasaki et al.

a. As per claim 17, Ejzak in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak in view of Sawada fails to teach the serving entity providing access to at least one service agent used to access and control said at least one remote service.

Kawasaki teaches the serving entity providing access to at least one service agent used to access and control said at least one remote service (See col. 1, lines 28-30 and col. 2, lines 9-13)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kawasaki in the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of

Sawada in order to provide a control system which is easy to manipulate for operating home electrical appliances (See col. 1, lines 25-26).

b. As per claim 18, Ejzak in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak in view of Sawada fails to teach wherein at least one of said at least one service agent is a computer software module executable on a computer.

Kawasaki teaches wherein at least one of said at least one service agent is a computer software module executable on a computer (See col. 1, lines 28-30, col. 4, lines 30-36 and col. 2, lines 9-13).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kawasaki in the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of Sawada in order to provide a control system which is easy to manipulate for operating home electrical appliances (See col. 1, lines 25-26).

c. As per claim 19, Ejzak in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak in view of Sawada fails to teach activating said software module prior to invoking a particular remote service.

Kawasaki teaches activating said software module prior to invoking a particular remote service (See col. 1, lines 28-30, col. 2, lines 9-13 and col. 4, lines 34-35);

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kawasaki in the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of

Sawada in order to provide a control system which is easy to manipulate for operating home electrical appliances (See col. 1, lines 25-26).

d. As per claim 20, Ejzak in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak in view of Sawada fails to teach activating said software module on demand after a particular remote service has been invoked.

Kawasaki teaches activating said software module on demand after a particular remote service has been invoked (See col. 4, lines 28-30, col. 2, lines 9-13 and col. 4, lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kawasaki in the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of Sawada in order to provide a control system which is easy to manipulate for operating home electrical appliances (See col. 1, lines 25-26).

e. As per claim 21, Ejzak in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak in view of Sawada fails to teach storing said software module at a data repository.

Kawasaki teaches storing said software module at a data repository (See col. 4, lines 28-30, col. 2, lines 9-13 and col. 4, lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kawasaki in the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of Sawada in order to provide a control system which is easy to manipulate for operating home electrical appliances (See col. 1, lines 25-26).

f. As per claim 22, Ejzak in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak in view of Sawada fails to teach dynamically retrieving and activating said software module from the data repository after invoking a particular remote service.

Kawasaki teaches dynamically retrieving and activating said software module from the data repository after invoking a particular remote service (See

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kawasaki in the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of Sawada in order to provide a control system which is easy to manipulate for operating home electrical appliances (See col. 1, lines 25-26).

10. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0027569 to Ejzak in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735719 to Sawada as applied to claim above, and further in view of Smart Antennas for wireless communications to Liberti et al.

a. As per claim 23, Ejzak in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak in view of Sawada fails to teach wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a first generation, analog, cellular network.

Liberti et al teaches wherein wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a first generation, analog, cellular network; (See page 1 and table 1.1, *Evolution of Wireless communications*).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the wireless communications system of Liberti et al to render the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of Sawada and further in view of Kawasaki operative and functional.

b. As per claim 24, Ejzak in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak in view of Sawada fails to teach wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a second generation, digital, cellular network.

Liberti et al teaches wherein wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a first generation, analog, cellular network; wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a second generation, digital, cellular network (See page 1 and table 1.1, *Evolution of Wireless communications*).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the wireless communications system of Liberti et al to render the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of Sawada and further in view of Kawasaki operative and functional.

11. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0027569 to Ejzak in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735719 to Sawada as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7, 092699 to Hefter.

a. As per claim 25, Ejzak in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak in view of Sawada fails to teach wherein the step of dialing-up directly to the service entity further includes passing dialing signaling and control data to the serving entity through an intermediary data network.

Hefter teaches wherein the step of dialing-up directly to the service entity further includes passing dialing signaling and control data to the serving entity through an intermediary data network (See col. 9, lines 33-53).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hefter in the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of Sawada in order to integrate wireless devices with the Internet (See col. 1, lines 43-45).

b. As per claim 26, Ejzak in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Ejzak in view of Sawada fails to teach wherein the step of dialing-up to the serving entity through a data network, further includes dialing-up to the serving entity through a sequence of at least one data network, the last one of which the serving entity is attached to.

Hefter teaches wherein the step of dialing-up to the serving entity through a data network, further includes dialing-up to the serving entity through a sequence of at least one data network, the last one of which the serving entity is attached to (See col. 9, lines 33-53).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hefter in the claimed invention of Ejzak in view of Sawada in order to integrate wireless devices with the Internet (See col. 1, lines 43-45).

12. Claims 32-35 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,092699 to Hefter in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735619 to Sawada.

a. As per claim 32, Hefter teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hefter fails to teach wherein said browser server is used to obtain, organize, and manipulate data received from and data sent to the client device through the protocol transport module.

Sawada teaches wherein said browser server is used to obtain, organize, and manipulate data received from and data sent to the client device through the protocol transport module (See col. 2, lines 20-49 and col. 4, lines 30-34).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to make it easy to control information of the home network services (see col. 1, lines 30-34).

b. As per claim 33, Hefter teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hefter fails to teach wherein said data sent to the client device are displayed and viewed by the browser application in the client device.

Sawada teaches wherein said data sent to the client device are displayed and viewed by the browser application in the client device (See col. 4, lines 47-48).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to make it easy to control information of the home network services (see col. 1, lines 30-34).

c. As per claim 34, Hefter teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hefter fails to teach wherein said data sent includes a list of services that are accessible by the client device.

Sawada teaches wherein said data sent includes a list of services that are accessible by the client device (See col. 2, lines 20-49).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to make it easy to control information of the home network services (see col. 1, lines 30-34).

d. As per claim 35, Hefter teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hefter fails to teach wherein said data received by the browser application in the client device include a selection of at least one service the user of the client device controls and an action to be taken for a selected service, and upon receipt of the action the browser server interacts with a particular service agent to implement the control logic for controlling the selected service, wherein a control signal generated by the service agent exits the apparatus through attachment of the home network.

Sawada teaches wherein said data received by the browser application in the client device include a selection of at least one service the user of the client device controls and an action to be taken for a selected service, and upon receipt of the action the browser server interacts with a particular service agent to implement the control logic for controlling the selected service,

wherein a control signal generated by the service agent exits the apparatus through attachment of the home network (See col. 2, lines 20-53).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to make it easy to control information of the home network services (see col. 1, lines 30-34).

e As per claim 39, Hefter teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Hefter teaches said dial-in server module triggers at least one particular module in the apparatus to process any incoming calls and requests from the client device; and said dial-in server module performs user authentication (See col. 9, lines 11-25 and lines 33-55). However, Hefter fails to teach wherein the apparatus further comprises selective implementation capability of limiting the apparatus capability to any combination of the following limitations: said browser server is used to obtain, organize, and manipulate data received from and data sent to the client device through the protocol transport module; said data sent to the client device are displayed and viewed by the browser application in the client device; said data sent includes a list of services that are accessible by the client device; said data received by the browser application in the client device include a selection of at least one service the user of the client device controls and an action to be taken for a selected service, and upon receipt of the action the browser server interacts with a particular service agent to implement the control logic for controlling the selected service, wherein a control signal generated by the service agent exits the apparatus through attachment of the home network.

Sawada teaches wherein the apparatus further comprises selective implementation capability of limiting the apparatus capability to any combination of the following limitations: said browser server is used to obtain, organize, and manipulate data received from and data sent to the client device through the protocol transport module; said data sent to the client device are displayed and viewed by the browser application in the client device; said data sent includes a list of services that are accessible by the client device; said data received by the browser application in the client device include a selection of at least one service the user of the client device controls and an action to be taken for a selected service, and upon receipt of the action the browser server interacts with a particular service agent to implement the control logic for controlling the selected service, wherein a control signal generated by the service agent exits the apparatus through attachment of the home network (See col. 2, lines 20-53 and col. 4, lines 30-48).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to make it easy to control information of the home network services (see col. 1, lines 30-34).

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DJENANE M. BAYARD whose telephone number is (571)272-3878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Djenane M Bayard/
Examiner, Art Unit 2441